

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. D. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Wayn period group

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/779,596	02/09/2001	Jean-Richard Neeser	88265-406	88265-406 6562	
28765 7:	590 01/29/2004		EXAMINER		
WINSTON & STRAWN			KERR, KATHLEEN M		
PATENT DEP. 1400 L STREE			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3502			1652		
			DATE MAILED: 01/29/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/779,596 NEESER ET AL.		
Advisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Kathleen M Kerr	1652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with th	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).</li> </ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti IE FINAL REJECTION.	ion. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offlied, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	If extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The apportion or the final o	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>12 January 2004</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			orth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			•
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	. ,	C.	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NC	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,4,6-10 and 23-29.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. Other:			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: In Claim 1, the addition of the word "human" raises issues of clarity since earlier in the claim, a treatment of humans AND ANIMALS is specified. Moreover, in Claim 7, the apparent GenBank numbers added to the claim, previously seen in Claim 8, raise issues of clarity.

PONNATHAPU ACHUTAMURTHY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600